UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/542,578	05/15/2006	Marie-Claire Janailhac	JANAILHAC1	6899
1444 7590 01/08/2007 BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C. 624 NINTH STREET, NW			EXAMINER MI, QIUWEN	
SUITE 300 WASHINGTO	N, DC 20001-5303		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1655	
SHORTENED STATUTOR	RY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		01/08/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

10		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/542,578	JANAILHAC ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Qiuwen Mi	1655			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any I	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATES of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. The period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timused and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE!	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status		*				
1) 🛛	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 No	ovember 2006.				
		action is non-final.				
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)⊠	Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 4-6 and 8-15 is/are w Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-3 and 7 is/are rejected. Claim(s) 1-3 and 7 is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	ithdrawn from consideration.				
Applicati	on Papers					
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the Eddrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). lected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority u	inder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) △ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) △ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. △ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachmen	t(s)					
2) Notice	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Måil Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate			

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of claims 1-3, and 7-12 in the reply filed on 11/24/2006 is acknowledged. Applicant also elected species recited in claim 7.

Claims 4-6, and 8-15 are withdrawn from further consideration since they are drawn to non-elected claims.

Specification Objections

The specification is objected to because of the following informalities:

The use of the trademarks such as "Sequestrene®NA4/Celon®E/Trilon®B, Nipagin®M/methyl-POB, and Carbopol®940" has been noted in this application. They and any other trademarks should be capitalized wherever they appear in the specification and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

Claims 1-3 and 7 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Application/Control Number: 10/542,578

Art Unit: 1655

The use of the trademarks such as "Sequestrene®NA4/Celon®E/Trilon®B, Nipagin®M/methyl-POB, and Carbopol®940" has been noted in this application. They and any other trademarks should be capitalized wherever they appear and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections –35 USC § 112, 1st

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as based on a disclosure which is not enabling. Chemical names of the components that are critical or essential to the practice of the invention, but not included in the claim(s) is not enabled by the disclosure. See *In re Mayhew*, 527 F.2d 1229, 188 USPQ 356 (CCPA 1976). Full generic chemical names of the reagents such as Sequestrene®NA4/Celon®E/Trilon®B, Nipagin®M/methyl-POB, and Carbopol®940 are not included in the claims or specification, therefore one of the ordinary skill in the art will not be able to carry out the invention.

Claim Rejections -35 USC § 112, 2nd

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-3, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The language in claims 1-3, and 7 contains the plant name "Aphanizomenon flos-aquae flos-aquae" which is incorrect and confusing, the correct name should be "Aphanizomenon flosaquae var. flos-aquae" [see Li (Hydrobiologia 438: 99-105, 2000, page 102, Table 1]. Correction is required.

The language in claim 7 contains trademarks such as

Sequestrene®NA4/Celon®E/Trilon®B, Nipagin®M/methyl-POB, and Carbopol®940 which are not searchable since it is not clear what they are. Applicant is required to provide full generic chemical names of the reagents that are used in the claims since such trademarks do not tell one of ordinary skills in the art exactly what is in the compounds and such trademarks can change the compositions at any time..

Claim Rejections -35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Application/Control Number: 10/542,578

Art Unit: 1655

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li (Hydrobiologia 438: 99-105, 2000) in view of Bryan (US 6,416, 960).

Li teaches the taxonomic of cyanobacteria genus *Aphanizomenon* and species *Aphanizomenon flos-aquae var. flos-aquae*. Li indicates that *Aphanizomenon flos-aquae var. flos-aquae* in fish pound (as aqueous solution) are used as a health food supplement by several hundred thousand consumers in Northern America (see entire document including, e.g., page 102, Table 1; page 104, right column, second paragraph).

Li does not teach that Aphanizomenon flos-aquae var. flos-aquae used topically or existing in a control released form.

Bryan teaches a protein derived from cyanobacteria in control-released formulas could be used orally or topically (see the entire document, e.g., column 33, lines 60-65; column 49, lines 5-10 and 29-30; column 50, lines 37-41).

Therefore, it would have been *prima facie* obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the inventions of Li and Bryan since Bryan teaches that local administration of the conjugates derived from cyanobacteria is preferred as tumors and vascular proliferative disorders will typically be visualized by the modes of administration, and certain toxic and undesirable side effects are more tolerated. Also, Bryan points out that control

Application/Control Number: 10/542,578

Art Unit: 1655

released formulations are particularly useful for application to the eye for ophthalmic indications following or during surgery in which only a single administration is possible (see the entire document, e.g., column 49, lines 27-43; column 50, lines 37 to 48). Since the invention in Bryan yielded beneficial results in the detection and visualization of neoplastic tissues, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make the modifications. The result-effective adjustment in conventional working parameters (e.g., determining an appropriate amount of the components within the composition) is deemed merely a matter of judicious selection and routine optimization which is well within the purview of the skilled artisan.

Thus, the invention as a whole is *prima facie* obvious over the references, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

Claim 7 is free of the prior art.

Conclusion

No claim is allowed.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Qiuwen Mi whose telephone number is 571-272-5984. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 to 5.

Application/Control Number: 10/542,578 Page 7

Art Unit: 1655

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terry Mckelvey can be reached on 571-272-0775. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MICHAEL MELLER
PRIMARY EXAMINER